

Hydrodynamical Beam Jets in High Energy Hadronic Collisions*

U. Ornik^{a †}, R. M. Weiner^{b ‡} and G. Wilk^{c §}

^a GSI Darmstadt, Darmstadt, F.R.Germany

^b Physics Department, University of Marburg, F.R.Germany

^c SINS, Nuclear Theory Department, Warsaw, Poland

A study of hadronic data up to TEVATRON energies in terms of relativistic hydrodynamics indicates an extended 1-dimensional stage of the expansion which suggests a jet like behaviour of the fireball along the collision axis.

The Landau Hydrodynamical Model (LHM) exists already for 40 years but there has been little progress in understanding its successes. Hydrodynamics assumes in general local thermal equilibrium (l.e.), a condition difficult to realize in small and short lived hadronic systems with a typical size of 10^{-13} cm and a corresponding lifetime of $\sim 10^{-23}$ sec. The discovery of subentities of hadrons (quarks and gluons) with the associated proliferation of degrees of freedom has facilitated the believe in l.e. [1], nevertheless the phenomenological success of the LHM has not been understood so far. The situation is better for heavy ion reactions which are larger systems, and where it is easier to get l.e.

We want to suggest that one possible reason for the success of LHM in hadronic reactions is the fact that Landau [2] and most of his followers used *only* a 1-dimensional (1d) solution which corrects for the possible absence of l.e. in these reactions. This conclusion follows from a comparison of 1d and 3d solutions to be reported below. The 1d approach assumes that the strongly compressed initial fireball expands at first mainly in the longitudinal direction (the width of the rapidity distribution is directly connected with the strength of this flow). Then a conical (3d) correction follows. A reasonable estimation for the moment τ_{3d} when the conical expansion starts (R denotes the transverse radius of the fireball) is:

$$\tau_{3d} = \sqrt{t^2 - x^2} = a_{3d}R \quad (1)$$

*to appear in the Proceeding of Quark Matter 93

[†]E. Mail: ORNIK@TPRI6B.GSI.DE

[‡]E. Mail: WEINER@VAX.HRZ.UNI-MARBURG.DE

[§]E. Mail: WILK@FUW.EDU.PL

where a_{3d} is a phenomenological parameter (determined by Landau from simple geometrical considerations [2] to be equal to $a_{3d} \equiv a_L = (1 + c_0^2)/c_0^2$; c_0 is the speed of sound).

In Fig. 1 we present rapidity distributions calculated for “conical” 1d and 3d [3] solutions compared with $\bar{p}p$ data at SPS ($\sqrt{s} = 20$ GeV) and ISR ($\sqrt{s} = 53$ GeV) energies. The 3d solution uses c_0 as given by lattice QCD [3] and $K = 0.35$ at $\sqrt{s} = 20$ GeV and $K = 0.176$ at $\sqrt{s} = 53$ GeV. More realistic values of K lead even to a worsening of the agreement with data. The 1d solution uses $c_0^2 = 0.18$ at $\sqrt{s} = 20$ GeV and $c_0^2 = 0.195$ at $\sqrt{s} = 53$ GeV and $K = 0.5$.

It turns out that only the 1d solution is able to fit the data with reasonable values for c_0 and inelasticity K . The transverse expansion (present only in the 3d case) develops at the expense of the longitudinal expansion and therefore reduces the width of the rapidity distribution. However, going to still higher energies we have found that one has to increase the duration of the 1d stage even further (by increasing a_{3d} above the limit a_L given by Landau). In Fig. 2 we show fits to different pseudorapidity distributions which are obtained with a_{3d} increasing from $\sqrt{2}a_L$ at $\sqrt{s} = 53$ GeV to $\sqrt{10}a_L$ at 1800 GeV. We have checked that these results hold (almost) independently of the concrete variant of initial conditions and equation of state (EOS) provided they are physically reasonable.

This observation poses a serious problem for LHM because the corresponding extended 1d stage is not present in the “real” 3d dynamics (which is based on the assumption that each fluid cell has in its rest frame an isotropic pressure - a result of the assumed isotropic momentum distribution corresponding to local equilibrium (l.e.)). One might therefore argue that because of the breakdown of l.e. conventional hydrodynamics is not valid anymore. On the other hand, the success of 1d LHM in describing data, illustrated above, allows also a different interpretation. In the following we shall argue that at high energies a “new” physical effect occurs, namely a strong anisotropy in the flow caused by some physical processes acting on top of the conventional hydrodynamical description.

The simplest “model” for such an anisotropy would be to postulate the existence of beam jets associated e.g. with the leading particles. This would make necessary a reformulation of the inelasticity effect in the LHM. So far inelasticity K was considered in the LHM by assuming that only the function K of the available energy contributed to the mass of the fireball which underwent hydrodynamical expansion [3,4]. In this way the leading particles “had done their job” and did not interfere anymore with the central fireball. This treatment may be an oversimplification. A more realistic approach in this direction is represented by the two component model proposed in [5]. It is based on the analysis of multiplicity distributions $P(n)$ at energies between 20 and 540 GeV [6]. They were interpreted as indicating the presence of two different types of sources emitting secondaries: (i) - *chaotic*, provided by gluonic interaction (i.e., equilibrated) and concentrated in the central rapidity (i.e., hydrodynamical) region with $P(n)$ of negative binomial type and (ii) - *coherent*, provided by the leading valence quarks (therefore far from equilibrium) and extending over the entire rapidity region (but contributing mainly to fragmentation region) with $P(n)$ consistent with a Poisson distribution. In this context the anisotropy and the elongation of τ_{3d} can be viewed as a manifestation of the *coherent*

component due to the leading valence quarks⁵.

Formally these possibilities could be formulated in terms of anisotropic hydrodynamics as proposed in [7]. In the present study we shall limit ourselves just to consider the extended 1d stage as a phenomenological observation which may have consequences for the interpretation of data from future experiments for hadronic and heavy ion collisions (RHIC, LHC or SSC). Here the hadronic reactions provide a lower limit for stopping, lifetime and equilibration and an upper limit for the width of the rapidity distribution σ . For this last quantity we get as an upper limit

$$\sigma \leq \sqrt{\ln R/\delta_i} + \sigma_{therm}; \quad (\sigma_{therm} < 1.65 \quad \text{for} \quad T_f < 0.2 \text{ GeV}). \quad (2)$$

where δ_i is the initial longitudinal extension of the fireball and σ_{therm} the contribution of the thermal motion to the rapidity width. It grows with energy slower than the phase space. This is shown in Fig. 3. A hydrodynamic stage in high energy collisions leads therefore to a limited value of σ (e.g. $\sigma < 5$ at LHC energies). It can be also shown that all relevant information concerning the transition from a strongly interacting non-equilibrium system to a thermalized fireball is contained in the fragmentation region (i.e., the phase space region where the transition from a local equilibrium in a pre-equilibrium stage takes place. This is also illustrated in Fig.4 where one can see how the initial longitudinal size of the fireball (determined in the pre-equilibrium stage) is strongly reflected in the shape of rapidity distribution. The main effects appear in the fragmentation region.

We conclude than that a hydrodynamical analysis of $\bar{p}p$ data indicates a large extension of the 1d stage of the expansion and is described approximately by the Khalatnikov solution [2]. The observation of the fragmentation region ($3 < y_{cm} < 5$) is essential for the investigation of the transition from the pre-equilibrium to the local equilibrium stage of the reaction.

This work was supported in part by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, the Gesellschaft für Schwerionenforschung and the Polish State Committee for Scientific Research, Grant No. 2 0957 91 01.

REFERENCES

1. Cf. e.g. E. Shuryak, The QCD Vacuum, Hadrons and the Superdense Matter, World Scientific 1988; L.Van Hove, Z. Phys. C21 (1983) 93 and C27 (1985) 135.
2. L.D. Landau and S.Z. Bilenkij, Nouvo Cim. Suppl. 3 (1956) 15; I.M. Khalatnikov, Zh. Eksper. Teor. Fiz. 27 (1954) 185.
3. U.Ornik, F.W.Pottag and R.M. Weiner, Phys. Rev. Lett. 63 (1989) 2641.
4. P. Carruthers and Minh Duong-Van, Phys.Rev. D28 (1983), 130.
5. G.N. Fowler et al.,Phys. Rev. Lett. 57 (1986), 2119; M. Biyajima et al., Phys.Rev. D43 (1991), 1541; cf. also: G.Wilk et al., in Proc. of The First German-Polish Symp.

⁵ Another, more radical possibility would be to assume that the configuration space in high energy hadronic reactions has fractal nature meaning effectively that the number of dimensions d is less than 3.

- on Particles and Fields, April 1992, Rydzyna Castle, Poland, eds. M.Pawłowski et al., World Scientific 1993, in print.
6. G. Alner et al., Phys.Lett. B160 (1985) 193.
 7. I. Lovas et al., Phys. Rev C45 (1987) 141; B. Kaempfer et al., Phys. Lett. B240 (1990) 297.